Jim - I've read and enjoyed Wrone's piece. I like some of his day comments that in many cases are all that need be said. You anticipated my reaction incorrectly, leading me to anticipate that he might have had unkind things to say about me. I have made much more severe criticism of my own work. In one case I'm unsure of what he has in mind. I suppose his comment about organization is directed mostly to WWII. If not I still am without resentment for I believe more serious comment is justified. Nor do I disagree with his estimate of Sylvia's work, rather of her book. Some of her magazine work is not of the same character or in the same league. Aside from fairly extensive factual error, all of which could have been eliminated if someone who really knows the field had read it for him (and I'm sure he and any who may have read it are unaware of it), this gets to one of my two more serious criticisms of its failings. It is typical of the work of a professional historian, not Plutarchian. Here its flatness and lack of perspective (and in some case very bad judgement) diminish its value, especially historically. The magazine part is seriously flawed by an excessive devotion to Sylvia's minor work and by the ignoring of several that were and remain of significance. There is here and most of all with Penn major disbalance. He went wild on Penn, and there really is nothing to justify it. The work is from any perspective really very bad and Penn has really done nothing that can be called serious investigation. If he has any major deposits of documents, he failed to show them to me and to reflect them in his work. Quite the contrary is true. He failed to do the most primitive work when he alone was on the scene. I took him around with me when I did only the obvious that he had failed to do and it blew his mind. In turn, that blew mine. He hadn't even tried to interview major witnesses (Wrone's evaluation of major witnesses is dubious at best, again flat and without perspective), wasn't able to find some (like Macharm ('I did without trouble and Penn was with me when I interviewed him on tape), couldn't or wouldn't follow up (as with Macharm and the Odio story). The full extent of Penn's failure and incompetence are almost beyond comprehension and require the effort of work in Dallas, which is remarkably easy, for understanding. (There is no single person who declined to be interviewed by me, anyway-and look what I'd written before I ever went there!). When Wrone talks about Garrison's extensibe investigations he mx crosses the line into fiction. In telling you frankly what I think I may give you the idea that I don't like his piece. Not so. And I rather enjoyed reading it. Rather I am saying that in the first thing of its sort of which I know he fell far short of what he could have done and what I'd have expected of him. On simple, factual things, if you have any interest, I have marked my copy up. He has made unwarranted assumptions, for example. Some are, for the future, serious errors. If you read it, I'm surprised you let pass the statement that the FBI supplied the WC with the spectro. And minor error (renovation of the car in Detroit rather than Cincinnati). Interpretive error (the number of witnesses on the stairs and the number who were WC witnesses and questioned about it). Careless